

ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE
ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE,
NOW
The New England Anti-Imperialist League.

THE HON. WINSLOW WARREN PRESIDED.

Mr. Warren said, in substance :

“ We have a difficult problem before us, but I do not know that it is any more difficult than it has been from the beginning. The Administration — if the serial story that comes from the Philippines can be believed — threatens, or alleges, I will say, that it has broken up the best hope for free government that the East has ever seen. If they take any credit to themselves for that, they are welcome to the whole of it, so far as we are concerned, but if it be true, a worse elephant remains on the hands of the American people.

“ The destruction of Aguinaldo’s forces, the burning of his towns, and his own flight does not end the question before the American people. The question is just beginning, and it never will be ended until the American people — not the Republican Administration — have said what they want and what they propose to do, and when they say that they will have their way, — but as yet the final word is not in, by any means.

“ I think that all parties have come to the conclusion that the last elections were not particularly satisfactory. Even the “ New York Tribune ” admits that there is trouble in the air. If it be true that the forces of the Filipinos are broken up, and that, as our friend General Otis says, there can be no pretence to the fiction that there is a government there, of course the Administration has the opportunity to go to Congress and say, “ There is no government there. What are you going to do about it ? ” I have no doubt that is what the Administration has been working for.

“ If that is the situation, what are we to do ? In the first place, we are to carry on the fight. We will be faced by three alternatives. One is to say plainly, ‘ You have broken up that government intentionally. It gave fair promise of freedom to the Filipinos, and you broke it up,

not with the consent of Congress or the people of America, and we propose to set it up again where it belongs.' If that is not adopted, we will have either to hold those possessions in a system of colonial slavery, abolishing the idea of taxation with representation, abolishing all the principles which we have striven for; or we shall have to recognize them as Territories of the United States, to be made States in due time. If any man can contemplate the possibility of making of those islands States of the American nation, I pity that man, and I pity the American nation.

"With regard to the operation of the tariff, I cannot conceive it possible that any court in this country would hold otherwise than that the tariff extends, by virtue of the Constitution, to any possessions of the United States. Children born in the islands since the ratification of the treaty would also be citizens of the United States.

"We are justified in placing this question before the people. The contest is not yet over."

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY.

Since the organization of the Anti-Imperialist League, Nov. 19, 1898, two general meetings have been held at Young's Hotel, Feb. 10, 1899, and May 16, 1899.

A report was submitted at each which covered the work of the Executive Committee and of the office, up to those dates respectively.

Stated meetings of the Executive Committee have been held since May 16 continuously through the summer — none having failed of a quorum.

Besides the very large correspondence, including hundreds of items of mail matter daily, requiring individual attention, the work of the office may be classified under three heads:

1. THE PROMOTION OF PUBLIC MEETINGS AND THE SUPPLY OF SPEAKERS.

On the fourth of July the Hon. W. E. Mason delivered an address through our agency at a large public meeting in Boston; the Rev. S. R. Fuller has spoken in behalf of our cause at Detroit; Dr. Frank S. Billings, of Grafton, and Mr. Gamaliel Bradford at the Brooklyn Philosophical Institute; Capt. Patrick O'Farrell, of Washington, and

Mr. Bradford at open-air meetings on Labor Day; and on innumerable lesser occasions we have suggested or supplied suitable orators and furnished literature and documents for distribution.

2. LITERATURE AND DOCUMENTS.

The petitions against the extension of sovereignty in the Philippines have been widely circulated and continue to come in. Many thousand names have been received since the adjournment of Congress, and await presentation. One notable petition contains two thousand names of women of Cleveland, Ohio, collected by one person. Another of one thousand seven hundred names came through the Daughters of the Revolution.

The literature printed and distributed since the last report, besides former publications and donations, has been not less than two hundred thousand pieces. In addition to free distribution of it at public meetings, we have given it from the office, sent it in response to applications, and to mailing lists furnished us, and forwarded it in packages to branch leagues and agencies for local distribution. In keeping our work apart from politics, we have made it a rule, — though gladly supplying political organizations with our publications when asked to do so, — to charge a small price for them. Otherwise they have been in almost all cases freely given away. Postage and expressage and freight have been among our largest items of expense.

This distribution covered the whole country, and has been gratefully welcomed and quickly absorbed. There seems no limit to the demand for the matter we furnish. It has now reached the proportions of a considerable bibliography. The titles since the last enumeration are:

“Imperialism and Anti-Imperialism,” Address to the Conference on May 16, the Hon. G. S. Boutwell.

“American Imperialism,” Prof. George D. Herron.

Address, the Rev. J. C. Kimball.

“The Conquest of the United States by Spain.” Prof. W. G. Sumner.

The Memorials from Señor Felipe Agoncillo, and the Constitution of the provincial Philippine Government.

A reissue of “Soldiers’ Letters.”

“A Question of National Honor,” the Hon. W. H. Fleming.

"Memoranda for the History of a War of Criminal Aggression," prepared by the Secretary.

"A Straightforward Tale," the Rev. Clay MacCauley.

"The Present Crisis," Edwin D. Mead.

"Rhymes without Treason," J. J. Dooling.

"A White Man's Brother," R. A. T. Bliss.

"As Others See Us," French and English points of view.

Leaflets: "The Burden of Taxes," and "Imperialism a Menace to Agriculture," Mr. Edward Atkinson and Mr. H. S. Frye.

"Why we cannot Conquer the Filipinos," a paper reprinted from "The Evening Post," of New York and given us by Mr. Dana Estes.

Additional "Broad-sides," bringing the number up to eight, and twelve small leaflets of selected matter.

"The Anti-Imperialist," five numbers, of which several thousand have been given by Mr. Edward Atkinson, in addition to his own large circulation of this noble series of tracts.

"Uncensored News," the Rev. Peter MacQueen.

"American Imperialism," the Hon. Carl Schurz.

"Our Future Foreign Policy," the Hon. Carl Schurz.

Leaflet, Hon. George W. Kelley.

"No Compromise with War," William Lloyd Garrison.

"The Spanish War, a prophecy or an exception?" the Hon. David J. Brewer.

"Oriental America," the Hon. Ora Williams.

"Private Smith in the Philippines."

"The War of Despotism in the Philippine Islands."

Address at Springfield, September 5, the Hon. George S. Boutwell.

Address at the Chicago meeting, October 17, the Hon. Carl Schurz.

Reissues of German leaflets.

"An arraignment of President McKinley's policy of extending by force the sovereignty of the United States in the Philippine Islands," F. A. Brooks.

"America's Apostasy."

Two patriotic songs set to music.

It may be said here that the poetry which our cause has inspired is abundant in quantity and that much of it is fine and noble in character. Mr. Garrison is our laureate, but there are many others. On the other side, there is, as might have been expected, no such inspiration: "False is the war no poet sings." Among authors the foremost

are with us. We count Mr. Howells, Mr. Stockton, and Mr. Richard Harding Davis, and we are glad to reckon Mr. Dooley again among the prophets.

A considerable number of our publications are electrotyped or in metal.

3. THE PROMOTION OF BRANCH LEAGUES.

It is probable that at least a hundred active centres of anti-imperialist work, under various titles, have followed our pioneer effort in the name of liberty, and are carrying on the propaganda, besides the hosts of individual workers throughout the country. The largest and most notable bodies are those in New York, Philadelphia, Springfield, Cincinnati, Washington, D.C., Los Angeles, Portland, Ore., and the recently established society in Minneapolis, after, of course, the central organization in Chicago, in favor of which we are about to propose to you that we should abdicate our primacy and become its New England branch.

During the last August the Secretary learned that members of our Board of Vice-Presidents were to be in Boston, and called a special conference of such of our friends as could be reached at that time, and on the very short notice which circumstances permitted. An excellent meeting was obtained, at which, among others, Governor Pingree, of Michigan; Mr. Samuel Bowles, of Springfield; and Mr. Edwin Burritt Smith, of Chicago, were present.

After a full discussion, the Secretary submitted a plan for a conference in the autumn, to precede a later general meeting next spring, — which was unanimously adopted; and a committee, appointed with full power, called this conference in Chicago for the 17th and 18th of October. The success of this meeting was extraordinary. Delegates from almost every State in the Union met a large number of local delegates in the business sessions, and the public meetings in the Central Music Hall were attended by some ten thousand people. The Hon. Carl Schurz made an exhaustive and final summary of the cause of liberty on the evening of the 17th. On the 18th the public meeting began at noon and continued with only an hour's intermission until ten o'clock at night, Mr. Bourke Cockran concluding the conference with a magnificent address.

The American Anti-Imperialist League was formed at this convention, to be localized in Chicago as the most

convenient situation for commanding effect and national influence. It will be one of our duties to adapt our title and constitution to the new order, in which we become a branch of the organization thus established.

At this moment when, by a reversal of the Saturn legend, we submit ourselves to be devoured by our offspring, we may reflect, that the Anti-Imperialist movement will be remembered in history as a disinterested and fervent protest against the menace to liberty at home and abroad which has befallen our generation in the United States. Weakness, incompetence, and afterwards what seems to be giddy and perverted ambition in high places, spurred on by greedy sycophants, encouraged by carelessness, recklessness, and the *laissez-aller* of prosperous democracy — might well have pursued unchecked its fatal career. Our testimony, so earnest, so united, and so obviously convincing to those who care to think and know how to feel, has at least vindicated the principles of republicanism and the faith of the fathers and proved that the immortal spark is not yet extinct.

In this campaign, though the final surrender, which is sure to come, may be the immediate consequence of a Saratoga or a Yorktown farther afield, it will not be forgotten that the locality of Concord and Buuker Hill was the cradle of liberty in 1898 as in 1776. In fact, it was literally from the cradle of liberty that the infant movement emerged, for the meeting of June 15, 1898, in Faneuil Hall, which led to the nomination of a committee of correspondence, was followed by the appointment of a coöperating committee from the Massachusetts Reform Club, and this joint committee called the meetings which adopted the constitution of the Anti-Imperialist League, now a great national organization with hundreds of thousands of members all over the country.

It is impossible, after the clouds of battle have cleared away from the field of the late elections, to deny the potent influence which our principles exerted in Ohio, Nebraska, Maryland, and Massachusetts. Eliminating some personal equations and allowing for local disturbances, the result is unexpectedly satisfactory, especially as the President's own State stands arrayed against his Administration by a majority of almost 74,000. It is not time yet to forecast the future. We make no pretence to call our will destiny, like those who bow down in hypocritical worship of the gods their own hands have fashioned. Our destiny is our immediate duty. It is to encourage

and assist our friends and the friends of human liberty in Congress to unite in a distinct and aggressive campaign against imperialism and the colonial idea.

We are promised the leadership of our venerated senior Senator and the aid of other Republican members of Congress, while many sincere Anti-Imperialists among the Democrats have assured us that they will also loyally follow this lead.

We have thus far kept apart from political affiliations. Until the battle is fought out our purpose should be to maintain an absolute independence of all lesser issues. To this effect testifies the address unanimously adopted by the Chicago conference, concerning a question to which short-sighted persons have given a relatively false prominence :

“Those who dispute about standards of value while the foundation of the Republic is undermined will be listened to as little as those who would wrangle about the small economics of the household while the house is on fire.”

This national conference decided, if it decided anything, that it is not now for us to cast presidential horoscopes, or to discuss candidates, or to promote party movements. As individuals, we reserve our independent notions and principles, and the right, when this question is settled, to go our several ways, but, at least until Congress has acted, we must in our organization stand shoulder to shoulder, Republican, Democrat, Socialist, Populist, Gold-man, Silver-man, and Mugwump, for the one momentous, vital, paramount issue, Anti-Imperialism and the preservation of the Republic.

The difficulties in the way of alienating our sovereignty over foreign possessions which have been acquired — if they have been legally acquired — wrongfully have been doubtless increased by the ten months' war with the inhabitants and natural owners of those possessions. This war, instituted by the President by his proclamation of Dec. 21, 1898, an act of despotic power, — absolutely indefensible, — was doubtless set on foot by Mr. McKinley for this very purpose. The drunkenness and dissoluteness in the streets of Manila, the slaughterings, ravishings, and burnings by the soldiery, and all the inevitable accompaniments of warfare, have done much to make hereditary enemies of those who were once our devoted and grateful friends. We have corrupted, discouraged, or killed some of those who were fitted to be

leaders of their nation, but there are still hundreds left who are capable of assisting the development of their own people, in their own way, the only possible evolution towards free government.

The opportunity, therefore, is still open to us to vindicate our claims as lovers of liberty and friends of those who are striving to maintain it all over the world. If so be that organized armed opposition has ceased, the cowardly plea can no longer be urged that our Government cannot treat with the foe in arms.

One practical word concerning our pressing needs. The national organization will probably hereafter attract the largest givers, yet it apparently counts on receiving contributions also from branch leagues, not on assisting them. It expects us to continue our work and to enlarge it, maintaining all our present connections, while it develops new fields. We ought to have great and prompt gifts to meet the requirements of the situation.

ERVING WINSLOW,
Secretary.

BOSTON, Nov. 25, 1899.

REPORT OF THE TREASURER.

Dr. ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE IN ACCOUNT WITH FRANCIS A. OSBORN, *Treasurer.* Cr.

To Expenditure, Nov. 18, 1898, to Nov. 25, 1899, inclusive, as follows:

For Postage and express charges on printed matter	\$1,878 52
Printing	2,416 39
Advertising	547 41
Expenses of public meetings	696 91
Travelling expenses	260 98
Engraving and printing certificates of membership	130 00
Clerk-hire, stationery, internal revenue stamps, and sundries	1,027 42
Contribution to expense of Chicago Conference, October 17, 18	100 00
Balance	445 72
	<hr/>
	\$7,503 35

Boston, Nov. 25, 1899.

(E. & O. E.)

By Contributions from 278 persons in 338 sums \$7,503 35

1899.

\$7,503 35

Nov. 25: By balance on hand . . . \$445 72

FRANCIS A. OSBORN, *Treasurer.*

THE NEW CONSTITUTION.

I

This organization shall be known as the NEW ENGLAND ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE. It shall be enrolled as a member of, and shall coöperate with, the American Anti-Imperialist League.

II.

This League is organized to aid in holding the United States true to the principles of the Declaration of Independence. It seeks the preservation of the rights of the people, as guaranteed to them by the Constitution. Its members hold self-government to be fundamental and good government but incidental. It is its purpose to oppose by all proper means the extension of the sovereignty of the United States over subject peoples. It will withhold its support from any candidate or party that stands for the forcible subjugation of any people.

III.

The officers of this League shall be a President, Vice-Presidents, a Secretary, and a Treasurer. Their duties and powers shall be those of like officers in similar organizations, subject to the control of the Executive Committee.

IV.

The work of the League shall be directed and controlled by an Executive Committee of not less than five members, in addition to the President, Secretary, and Treasurer, who shall be members *ex-officio*. Four members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. The Committee may from time to time appoint such standing and special committees as to it shall seem desirable, and may abolish any such committee or remove any member thereof at any time. No expenditure of the funds of the League shall be made or indebtedness incurred without its authority. It shall also have power to fill vacancies in its own membership and in any office of the League, to increase its own members and to add to the list of Vice-

Presidents. The officers and Executive Committee shall be elected by ballot at the annual meeting, and shall hold office for one year or until their successors have been elected.

V.

The Executive Committee may contribute a fair proportion of the funds of the League to the support of the general work of the American Anti-Imperialist League.

VI.

Those who enroll their names, or cause them to be enrolled, with the Secretary, shall be deemed members of the League. Such membership shall not subject the holder thereof to any pecuniary liability ; but it is hoped and expected that the members will voluntarily contribute to the support of the League to the extent of their several abilities. The members are expected to aid in the circulation of literature, in procuring signatures to petitions, and in the promotion of the work of the League.

VII.

The Annual Meeting of the League shall be held in Boston on the last Saturday of November, and the Executive Committee shall have power to call special meetings at any time by giving seven days' notice.

VIII.

This Constitution may be amended at any meeting of the League, by the affirmative vote of a majority of those present.

OFFICERS FOR THE ENSUING YEAR.

President.

GEORGE S. BOUTWELL.

Vice-Presidents.

THOMAS WENTWORTH HIGGINSON,

L. W. BACON,

SAMUEL BOWLES,

GAMALIEL BRADFORD,

PATRICK A. COLLINS,

HERBERT MYRICK,

W. G. SUMNER,

ALBION A. PERRY,

CHARLES G. AMES,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS,

EDWARD ATKINSON,

HENRY B. METCALF,

A. P. CHILDS,

GORDON WOODBURY,

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON,

CHARLES R. CODMAN,

F. A. BROOKS,

MOORFIELD STOREY,

HENRY W. LAMB.

Treasurer.

FRANCIS A. OSBORN.

Secretary.

ERVING WINSLOW.

Executive Committee.

WINSLOW WARREN,

DAVID GREENE HASKINS, JR.,

J. P. MUNROE,

ALBERT S. PARSONS,

DANA ESTES.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT,

THE HON. GEORGE S. BOUTWELL.

We shall embarrass ourselves if we try to find any other way than a direct way out of the difficulties in which the country has been placed. We and our friends, from time to time, may present to the country the evils which we think exist and are incident to the policy on which the President has entered. But behind all these evils is the evil of great magnitude, and which, if not now speedily arrested, can never be arrested until this country becomes like Rome and Spain, or England, that has reached the acme of her power, and henceforth hastens to her decline.

Our declaration is one, and everything else is but an incident to that declaration, and that is, that the people of the Philippine Islands, whether they are few or many, whether they are capable or incapable, are not ours. Jurisdiction, which has a claim to be observed, depends upon two facts: the people that are to be controlled and the people that are to control, and between them, as in every other agreement, there must be a concord of purpose expressed in the form which the agreement may take. Therefore I say we ought not to enter into the inquiry as to whether this thing or that thing can be done in the way of government, but only whether we have a right to exercise jurisdiction over the Philippine Islands.

If the Declaration of Independence be true, then this follows as a fact regarding which there can be no mistake: the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands are to decide for themselves what the form of government shall be under which they are to live; otherwise there is no freedom.

Let the people of the Philippine Islands say whether they wish to come to us; then let the American people decide whether we will have them. The probability is we shall decide that we do not wish to have them.

I have no misgivings as to the result of the pending presidential election. Of the eight-and-twenty presidential elections, I have participated in fifteen. I was in the contest of 1840 as a Democrat, and when, as a young man, I emerged from the débris after election I found that we had carried five States.

I see that there are reporters present, and I want them to take this down as my prophecy: If Mr. McKinley is the candidate of the Republican party upon the platform that he has created, he will be a more surprised man than Van Buren was, who believed until the end came that he was to be elected to the presidency of the United States. He was elected to return to Kinderhook.

As, in the course of my remarks, I shall criticise with freedom a position taken by Senator Lodge in his speech at the dinner of the Republican Club, it is a satisfaction to me to be able to anticipate myself in that respect, and to concur with the Senator in a view of public affairs which appears to be of signal importance to him, but which is of minor consequence to me.

A part of the opening of that speech, to the extent of a third of a newspaper column, was devoted to Mr. Croker, of Tammany Hall, New York. That feature was a surprise to me. Was Mr. Croker about to invade Massachusetts with his peculiar political system and better the teachings that we have had already? Was the speech an alarm signal gun? Further reading gave assurance that there was no peril in that direction. Mr. Croker had been in England. Upon his return he had expressed the opinion that the public sentiment of England was hostile to the present policy of the United States.

Senator Lodge had also been in England, and he asserts that Croker is in error, and the Senator refutes the error.

I concur with the Senator. England, the England of authority, is with us. We are engaged in the same business, with entire freedom from rivalry for the moment. England is engaged in suppressing the aspirations of infant republics in Africa, and we are crushing a young republic in Asia.

There is a concurrence of policy, there is also harmony of action, and there should be entire unity of sentiment and opinion in support of that action, among the advocates of the policy.

Mr. Croker may not have associated with the ruling classes in England, and he has returned to America with erroneous ideas concerning the future policy of Great Britain. Since the speech of October 31 was delivered, Senator Lodge's position has received very important support. Lord Salisbury has delivered his annual speech of recognized authority, and in that speech he gives us full assurance that England and the United States are in accord. English sentiment, by which English policy is

guided, is with us in the war in the Philippines, and with corresponding reasons our Administration and its supporters should give aid and encouragement to England in its efforts to subjugate its rebellious subjects in Africa.

But I pass from the controversy between Senator Lodge and Mr. Croker in the confident opinion that Mr. Croker is vanquished beyond hope of recovery.

Impressed as I am by the events of the times, I am forced to one ethical reflection.

We find melancholy evidence of the perversity of our human nature in the fact that the Filipinos refuse our tender of good government, and that the inhabitants of the southern quarter of the African continent, with like perversity, refuse the tender of good government at the hand of Lord Salisbury.

The world has been called to witness an impressive and instructive spectacle in two parts, and exhibited in two hemispheres.

At the unimportant city of Rennes the civil authorities of France have been engaged in an uncertain contest with the military power of the republic, a power already dangerous if not fatal to its freedom, whose existence is due in a large degree to the imperialistic spirit which has survived the Napoleons, and which has led France to contend for empire in Africa, in Asia, and in the islands and on the continent of America.

While these events are passing before us, the President of the United States has entered upon a policy of invasion, of conquest — a policy of vast navies and mighty armies — a policy which will furnish an excuse, and to many a justifying reason for the creation and maintenance of vast navies and mighty armies, through the lifetime of the nation, whether called republic or empire. Despotism — absolutism in government — is the necessity of the army and the navy, and in such schools and from such training can we expect to create or even to preserve ideas and practices that are consistent with republican institutions?

Already we are forced to listen to expressions from individual officers — expressions to which the body of their associates give no assent as yet — that are hostile to the principles on which this government was founded.

Herein is the criminal character of the President's policy — a policy of great armies in which the youth of the country are to be trained and in which their principles will be perverted. Liberty perishes in the presence of the

army. That is the maxim of the law deduced from the experience of ages.

In April last, in a speech that I delivered at the Tremont Temple, I made these observations concerning the President and the policy which he was then pursuing, and to which, as I think, he has adhered. I then said :

“The President has entered systematically upon a colonial policy in imitation of the colonial policy of Great Britain,” etc. “I give the President credit for ability, for signal ability, in the work of transforming the Government.”

The President’s speech made at Ocean Grove, Friday, Aug. 25, 1899, sustains these propositions. As I am to comment upon the speech, I reproduce it as it was printed in the papers of Aug. 26.

The President said : “Love of flag and love of country are not inconsistent with religious faith. I believe that there is more love for our country, and that more people love the flag, than ever before. Wherever the flag is raised it stands not for despotism and oppression, but for liberty, opportunity, and humanity, and what that flag has done for us we want to do for all people and all lands which, by the fortunes of war, have come within its jurisdiction. That flag does not mean one thing in the United States and another in Porto Rico and the Philippines. There has been doubt in some quarters respecting the policy of the Government in the Philippines. I see no harm in stating it in this presence. Peace first, then, with charity for all, establish a government of law, of order, protecting life and property and occupation, for the well-being of the people who will participate in it under the Stars and Stripes.” When the President finished, the “big building shook with the intensity of the applause.” When the tumult stopped the President said : “I have said more than I intended.”

The President eulogizes the flag, and he claims “that more persons love the flag than ever before.” This is an unimportant assertion. The important inquiry is this : Is the flag more worthy of the love of the people than ever before? Has Mr. McKinley’s Administration strengthened the affection of the people for the flag? The love of Americans for the flag, however they may deplore and regret the use to which it has been put in the Philippines, is not diminished. Such is their affection for the flag that they will redeem it from the degradation of foreign service in a war against human rights.

It may be true that the President said more in his brief speech at Ocean Grove than he intended, but what he did say is an admission in exact form of the evil policy which we were left to infer from his language on former occasions, but which seemed designed for concealment rather than for the information of the people.

Those who are opposed to the Philippinean war may thank the President for the disclosures made at Ocean Grove. His speech justifies these conclusions:

(1.) No compromise. The war is to go on until a peace has been conquered, and yet with charity for all.

(2.) A government is then to be set up by the United States.

(3.) The people of the Philippines will participate in that government "under the Stars and Stripes."

Not in that speech, nor in his speech of August 28 to the Pennsylvania volunteers, does he intimate that the inhabitants of the islands are to be a self-governing people, or that they are to become members of the American Union. The flag has been set up in the Philippines. Wherever the flag has been set up there it is to remain. "Wherever that flag is set up it stands." These words are from the Ocean Grove speech. Thus does the President lead the country into an English colonial policy. Thus does he confess to the justice of my statement of April last.

I repeat what I then said: "The President has entered systematically upon a colonial policy in imitation of the colonial policy of Great Britain." If not, will he then enlighten the country on these points:

Do you intend to allow the inhabitants of the Philippines the exercise of the right of self-government free from the jurisdiction of the United States?

Answering that question in the negative, or omitting to answer it, Do you favor the incorporation of the Philippine Islands into the American Union as the equals of the existing States?

And if these questions are answered in the negative, or if they shall remain unanswered, the American people may then demand an answer to this question: What is to be the policy of the United States in regard to the status and government of the Philippine Islands when their subjugation shall have been accomplished, if that event shall occur as the outcome of the President's policy? And to that question the American people will make answer by according to the inhabitants of the Philippines the right of self-government under a flag of their own choosing.

In the Philippine Islands our flag is no longer a flag of freedom, of equality, of justice. That, however, it once was. It is now an emblem of injustice, of wrong to 10,000,000 human beings, who, in the month of May, 1898, hailed its coming and accepted it as a messenger of peace, of independence, of justice.

In May, 1898, there were 10,000,000 Filipinos who respected the flag of the republic, and many of them were its devoted admirers. By the policy of the President and the doings of the army they have been changed to enemies of the flag. Upon a survey of the entire field, has the dominion of our flag been promoted? Can a war against humanity be justified or its horrors be palliated by eulogies of the flag under which the war has been carried on? Satisfy the country that the war is a just war, and eulogies upon the flag will not be needed.

The flag has not made America what America is, as the President would have us believe; but America, being what it is, what it was from 1776 to 1898, has made the flag what it was, what it has been, and what it has stood for in all that long period — the emblem of freedom, of justice, of human equality, of those essential principles that are set forth in the Declaration of Independence, which are now derided by supporters of the President's policy, and which cannot be read in any assembly of American citizens called to vindicate and justify that policy.

In harmony with the many declarations of the President, Senator Lodge says: "I vote with the army that wears the uniform and carries the flag of my country." Nothing more. He will not inquire whether the flag is carried in an honorable cause, but he will arraign and condemn those who may thus inquire. When the President has entered upon a war, or even when Congress may have declared a war, are the people to be stifled into silence or forced into timid acquiescence? In fine, is the flag, the free flag of America, to become the instrument for the suppression of that freedom which it was designed to cherish and to protect — the freedom to inquire, to judge, to pass finally upon every question, not merely upon the relatively insignificant questions of trade and finance, but as well upon the supreme question, not of this hour only, but of every hour of the republic, whether the national emblem of freedom at home, and of justice abroad, is to be degraded into the servile service of destroying the property and lives of millions of people in one island who owe us no allegiance and who have done us

no wrong, and to the hateful service of protecting slavery and polygamy in another island from which we neither have derived, nor can derive, any benefit whatsoever, and all in defiance and disregard of the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution, which was purchased at a price — a price such as was never paid in other times or elsewhere by human beings for any human good, — purchased by the lives of 400,000 citizen-soldiers, and by a contribution of \$6,000,000,000, wrought into gold from the labor of the survivors and their descendants?

And now comes Senator Lodge and tells us that there is to be no inquiry, no judgment.

The thirteenth amendment may be trampled under foot, the flag may be betrayed into the criminal service of suppressing freedom in one island and of upholding despotism in another, and we can only say: "I vote with the army that wears the uniform and carries the flag of my country."

Impotent conclusion! Unworthy of our American citizenship. On the contrary, let this be remembered: whatever may stand, or whatever may fall, let the American people keep in their own possession, as an undying right, freedom of debate, as the means, the only means by which they can restrain wrongdoing, the only means by which they can secure honest and acceptable service in public affairs. That freedom the President and Senator Lodge are denying, sometimes openly and sometimes covertly, but always denying. We are not to speak lest we may be heard by some one who, as the President thinks, ought not to hear.

If we are to speak, we speak that we may be heard. The printing-press and the telegraph are the enemies of wrongdoers and of wrongdoings, and without their aid the human voice would be powerless relatively. If our words are taken up and carried over the oceans it may be that men struggling for freedom may find cause for hope in the thought that America is not given over, wholly over, to a war of aggression and to the exercise of despotic powers.

If there shall be such a return to our words it will bring no rebuke to me, but rather inspiration and hope that they who are struggling for freedom are to achieve freedom.

But more important to us it is that we should withdraw our armies, that we should recognize the right of men to be free, and that we again, and our children after us, may

look upon a flag purged of all the impurities gathered in a war of aggression and of service in the protection of crimes forbidden by the Constitution and laws of the United States. When the flag of the republic was placed in the hands of William McKinley it was revered, it was beloved at home by all, and abroad it was respected by all, it was beloved by many, and it was neither hated nor distrusted by any. In these two years he has carried that flag into foreign lands and there set it up as an emblem of absolute power and demanded abject submission to his will from millions who owe no allegiance to him or to us. Is it strange that those millions hate the flag and hate us with an ineradicable hatred, or that the States of South America, republican States, that we welcomed into the confederacy of republics, should now contemplate a union of all for the protection of each against the process of "benign assimilation" under the folds of the American flag?

The outlook for the weaker States of the world has been rendered more forbidding than it might have been had not the claim been set up that Mr. McKinley is the compelled servant of a blind destiny, or the unwilling agent of an incomprehensible divinity. If either of these conjectures has a foundation in truth, then there can be no security that our flag may not be carried across the Rio Grande into Mexico, or to the mouth of the Amazon, or to the city of Rio Janeiro.

In such an event Senator Lodge can only say: "I vote with the army that wears the uniform and carries the flag of my country." Is herein to be found security for liberty? Or is it offered in justification for aggressive wars? Or as a defence for those who refused to suspend hostilities upon a tender of conciliation and peace?

Upon the statement of the Commission it appears that an American soldier fired the first shot in the Philippine war. No matter about the provocation. The shot opened the war. The act of the soldier was indorsed by General Otis in his refusal of peace when Aguinaldo tendered peace and a renewal of the *status quo*.

That act of war has been indorsed by the Administration, and in harmony with a policy on which the President had entered as early as the sixteenth day of June, 1898. This statement I undertake to establish by proof, and by the same evidence I shall demonstrate the fact of premeditated deception practised by the President upon Aguinaldo and his followers.

I refer first to a letter written by Consul Pratt to Secretary Day, dated April 28, 1898. The receipt of that letter was acknowledged by Secretary Day June 16, 1898. In this letter Secretary Day gives an account of the steps by which Aguinaldo was brought from Singapore and induced to coöperate with our forces. It is true that there is no statement of promises made to Aguinaldo, but in Pratt's letter of April 30 the position of Aguinaldo is set forth distinctly. Pratt says:

"The general further stated that he hoped the United States would assume protection of the Philippines, for at least long enough to allow the inhabitants to establish a government of their own, in the organization of which he would desire American advice and assistance." On the thirtieth day of May Mr. Pratt writes thus: "I have the honor to submit for your consideration a proclamation in Spanish, issued prior to the departure of our fleet for Manila, by the insurgent leaders in Hong Kong, calling upon the Filipinos not to obey the appeals of the Spaniards to oppose the Americans, but to rally in support of these, as they came as their friends and liberators."

The proclamation contained these words: "Divine Providence is about to place independence within our reach, and in a way that the most free and independent nation could hardly wish for.

"We, your brothers, are very much afraid that you may be induced to fire on the Americans. No, brothers, never make this mistake.

"There, where you see the American flag flying, assemble in numbers; they are our redeemers."

This proclamation was sent out from Hong Kong, with the knowledge and approval of Consul Pratt, who was then at that port. Without delay he communicated the facts, and the details of the facts, to the Secretary of State and to the President.

Especially were the expectations of Aguinaldo set forth in the letter of Consul Pratt of April 30.

At that point, and with that knowledge, what was the duty of President McKinley? He says, and his Peace Commissioners say, there was no alliance with Aguinaldo. I appeal from the interested opinion of interested men to the facts and to the rules of propriety, and to the rules of law applicable to the facts.

We solicited the aid of Aguinaldo. We called him from Singapore by an urgent telegraphic despatch from Dewey in these words:

“Tell Aguinaldo come soon as possible.

“DEWEY.”

We accepted his services and aid as guide and director in the expedition against Manila from May until November. He was coöperating with us and under our direction, for the expulsion of the Spaniards, and always, after a date earlier than the 16th of June, with full knowledge by the President of the terms under which Aguinaldo was rendering the much-needed service. What was the duty of the President when he had received knowledge that Aguinaldo had made his terms known to our accredited representatives, and under which he was coöperating with us? What was the rule applicable to the case, not the rule of law merely, which may be treated as the outgrowth of civilized, of cultured life, but the rule of ordinary propriety and justice, which, in the least enlightened class of the most rustic populations, is uniformly observed?

It was his duty to notify Aguinaldo that the arrangement could not be continued upon the terms that he had named, and that upon the expulsion of the Spaniards he and his people must submit unconditionally to the Government of the United States. It is now demonstrated that it was the purpose of the President as early as the sixteenth day of June, 1898, to compel the submission of the Filipinos. Under that date Mr. Day wrote to Mr. Pratt a letter in which he recited in detail the history of the steps by which Aguinaldo had been induced to leave Singapore and to coöperate with the United States in the expedition against Manila. Neither Mr. Pratt, nor Mr. Day, nor the President, needed any assurance upon one point. They knew that Aguinaldo did not obey the summons of Dewey with alacrity, and leave Singapore and enter with spirit at the hazard of his life into the expedition against Manila for the purpose of escaping from the tyranny of Spain, a weak power, and under the expectation that he was to encounter war and the threatened tyranny of the United States. The world knew the purpose of the Philippine war against Spain. The purpose was independence and self-government. Every one knew that who had heard of the rebellion. In the presence of this common knowledge, Mr. Day, under the direction of the President, ventured upon this false statement: “This Government has known the Philippine insurgents only as discontented and rebellious subjects of Spain, and is unacquainted with their purposes.” At that moment the

purposes of the insurgents were of common knowledge, and for years they had been known the world over, and never anywhere had there been a doubt that the twin purposes were independence and self-government.

To this assumed plea of ignorance of what was of common knowledge, the Secretary of State in his letter of June 16, 1898, informed Mr. Pratt of the purpose of the President in this paragraph: "The United States, in entering upon the occupation of the island, as the result of its military operations in that quarter, will do so in the exercise of the rights which the state of war confers, and will expect from the inhabitants, without regard to their former attitude toward the Spanish Government, that obedience which will be lawfully due from them."

More than once in the letter is Pratt cautioned against any arrangement with Aguinaldo, and yet while Aguinaldo was proceeding upon the expectation that he was gaining independence and statehood, the President was preparing to subjugate the Filipinos to the authority of the United States, and using Aguinaldo and his armies for the accomplishment of that purpose. When the Spaniards had been driven from the islands, when the protocol had been signed, when there was no longer a possibility of an alliance between the remnants of the Spanish armies and the Filipinos, then came the President's proclamation of Dec. 21, 1898, in which he asserted supreme dominion and exacted unconditional submission.

Whatever may be the extent of one's vocabulary, no one epithet can set forth the wickedness of this transaction. We accepted the services of Aguinaldo as an ally, and upon full notice that he expected in return independence and statehood. That knowledge on our part, and that service on his part, created a trust in us which yet remains unperformed. That trust, and the obligation arising from that trust, are to be performed by the American people, but in the meantime there may be those who will repeat the language of a Massachusetts Republican, who, in a discussion of the fugitive slave system, gave voice to this exclamation:

"I long for a more voluminous vocabulary in which I can express my abhorrence of this nefarious business."

In the presence of this history can it be said that the American flag is more worthy of our affection than ever before?

Has its character been advanced since it was put into the hands of Mr. McKinley? He asks: "Who will haul

down the flag?" We answer: "The flag is the flag of the people of the United States, and they will haul it down in all lands where it has been set up for purposes of aggressive war and brutal conquest." They will haul it down wherever it has been set up as the protector of crimes that are denounced by our Constitution and laws.

The flag of the American people is a flag of equality, of freedom, of justice at home and of justice abroad.

That flag they will cherish and defend, and they are realizing that eulogies are vain in presence of the degradation to which the flag has been subjected in the last twenty months.

The people of the United States will haul down the flag which President McKinley has set up in the Philippine Islands, and they will run up the flag of Washington, of Jefferson, of the Adamses of many generations, the flag of Abraham Lincoln, purified, as it was purified by the blood and sacrifices of 2,700,000 citizen-soldiers of the republic, from the stain, the hereditary stain, of the crime of slavery.

"Who will haul down the flag?" The question you put to us with taunts and in scorn we answer in a tone of defiance, it may be, but in full confidence that the authorities of the United States, under instructions which they will not venture to disobey, will haul down the flag that has been set up by force over an unwilling, but otherwise friendly, people.

A REPORT UPON THE NOVEMBER ELECTIONS.

Although Senator Burrows, Republican, of Michigan, in an article in the October "Forum," has said with some force that the elections of this month could give but little indication of the outcome of the presidential contest, still it is instructive to analyze their results, and comparison with previous elections puts some things in a new light. It must be always remembered that many Anti-Imperialists, probably thousands of them, voted the Republican ticket, in this off-year; and that the vote for the party candidates was, therefore, by no means all in favor of the Administration's Philippine policy. We must, therefore, deduct those thousands of votes, even from the Republican figures of this year, to get at the strength of the opposition to that policy.

Of the States holding elections this month general interest was fixed on only five: Maryland, Kentucky, Ohio, Iowa, and Nebraska; all but the last of which voted for McKinley in 1896, and all of which the Republicans hoped to carry this year, as an indorsement of the President and his foreign policy.

In Maryland, which has gone Republican since 1894, by pluralities varying from 7,000 to 32,000, the Democrats — aided, it is true, by a Republican faction fight — have made a clean sweep of both city and country, in spite of Governor Roosevelt's vigorous campaign for imperialism, carrying the State by some 12,000 votes. In Kentucky, the small Republican plurality, won simply as a result of a very bitter Democratic faction fight, shows that, with a united party, the Democrats are sure of the State.

In Ohio, the President's State, immense exertions were made by his party to secure an indorsement of his Administration. President McKinley, Governor Roosevelt, and many other distinguished men were brought into the State to speak; contributions were even solicited from the government clerks in Washington. Their candidate was a very popular man. The Democratic candidate was obnoxious to thousands of his party. The Democratic campaign has been pronounced lamentably weak. And yet, in spite of every exertion, in a total vote, which,

though much smaller than that in the last presidential year, was the largest ever cast for governor, the Republican vote was less than the average in recent years, — falling off 13,000 as compared with '97; and the clear Republican majority over all, which for some years has not failed, and which has usually ranged between 35,000 and 60,000, was wiped out, leaving an anti-McKinley majority of nearly 74,000 votes. And all but an insignificant fraction of the entire immense anti-Republican vote of 491,000 was cast for pronounced anti-imperialist candidates. Moreover, in the words of a distinguished Ohio Republican, "tens of thousands of those who voted and worked for Nash were, like John Sherman, bitterly opposed to the subjugation of the Filipinos." "I know the people of Columbus well," he continues, "and I know that among the level-headed, conservative men of the Republican party in this city, there are very few who approve the foreign policy of President McKinley. A significant feature of the election was the fact that the German Republican wards of Cincinnati, which are almost uniformly Republican, but in which Mr. Schurz's letters urging support of Anti-Imperialist candidates as the primary duty were widely circulated, gave unprecedented majorities for McLean.

In the staunch Republican State of Iowa the claims of gains for that party and its new policy can only be sustained by comparing the vote with their phenomenally small plurality of 1897. An exciting contest between two Republican aspirants for the United States Senate brought out a large party vote; the managers of that party insisted that free silver was the real and foremost issue before the people; they organized the campaign, most effectively and energetically; and yet, with apparently inefficient management on the other side, the best figures attainable show clearly that, compared with last year, the Democrats, who made the fight largely on the issue of imperialism, have made a considerable gain both actually and relatively; and that the State has given a Republican plurality smaller, with that one exception, than in any year since 1893.

In Nebraska, where national issues were freely discussed, the Anti-Administration fusion swept the State, with a majority, at least for its chief candidate, many thousands greater than last year. And the Omaha "Bee," the leading Republican paper in the State, insists that it was the issue of imperialism which caused the Republican defeat.

In Massachusetts the Anti-Imperialists' influence made itself felt in the Republican convention, forcing it to adopt a platform so ambiguous, and which might be construed as so nearly in accordance with their views, as to call out the scornful wrath of the chief imperialist paper in Boston. The Republican candidate, the present Lieutenant-Governor, was a man of such great personal popularity and of such very moderate views that he received the support of some of the strongest Anti-Imperialists in the State. The Democrats were demoralized, at variance among themselves, weighed down by a very radical State platform, and had a young candidate hardly known out of Boston. Their only hope of even holding their own lay in the support of the Anti-Imperialists, and Mr. Paine made his campaign almost entirely on this issue. The result was that he swept the city of Boston, which had been Republican in State elections since '95, by over six thousand plurality, and cut down by thousands of votes the Republican majority in the rest of the State.

It is well to realize for our encouragement, that even in '96, before there was an issue on the subject of imperialism, a transfer of less than twenty thousand votes from one side to the other in six States would have elected Mr. Bryan to the Presidency, leaving New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Ohio, and Illinois all in the Republican column.

The Committee congratulates the League and the Anti-Imperialists of the country on these results, and urges them to renewed exertions for the final and complete triumph, not of a party, but of the great principles of justice and human rights.

DAVID GREENE HASKINS, JR.,
For the Committee.

RESOLUTIONS.

Resolved, That in view of the great importance of the Philippine question, on which depend the lives of so many of our fellow-citizens and fellow-creatures, we respectfully and earnestly suggest to the clergy that in their sermons on Thanksgiving Day they accord the subject such treatment as the teachings of religion and the welfare of the nation, viewed in the light of their own good judgment, may dictate.

Resolved, That we repel with vigor the charge that Anti-Imperialists are "traitors" and "copperheads" because they are loyal to the Declaration of Independence; or because they respect in others the liberty which they maintain for themselves; or because they deny the right of one free people to claim sovereignty over another — much less to enforce it by bloody and cruel war.

Resolved, That, in any democratic republic, anti-imperialism is the only true patriotism, and that loyalty to the principles of our own great Declaration is the only true loyalty to the flag, which represents those principles. In the words of Lincoln, "those who deny freedom to others do not deserve it for themselves, and under a just God cannot long retain it."

Resolved, That, in order to refute this false charge of disloyalty in the most dignified and effective way, and thereby to undeceive thousands of honest voters who have been beguiled by political tricksters into believing it true, we urge every Anti-Imperialist at once to sign the following

PATRIOTS' PLEDGE

TO DEFEND THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE AT THE POLLS.

We, the undersigned voters, pledge ourselves to each other and to the American people to subordinate all other political issues, in 1900, to preservation of the free popular government founded by Washington and saved by Lincoln; to oppose at all costs the degradation of this democratic republic into a military empire; and to cast our ballots in favor of only such party platform

and candidates as shall be thoroughly loyal to the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the equal rights of all mankind.

Resolved, That we request the Executive Committee to use all possible means to obtain signatures to this "Patriots' Pledge" before Congress meets or can be induced to sanction the President's policy of conquest in the Philippine Islands.

Resolved, That the address of the President, the Hon. George S. Boutwell, and the Reports and Resolutions be printed.

